7

(9)

Mr Saraswati Sir
Keshowaiya - Inferior
Servant

Read clerked from the
Dy Comrs Order dated
19th Aug 1888 to 171 in
the matter Vth Document of Sita-
bai dt August 1887, the
Dy Comrs- discovered
a shortage for certain
offences committed by him
& directed the Amildar
to select a member of
the family of the dismissed
servant for the office of
one was Jethanoorey
who was competent to
perform the duties of
the office without the
intervention of the dismissed
man or of his brother who
was also connected with
the offences — He further
remarked that of such

Narayan Shambhog
Inferior Potter, Servant
Talati -

Order

man was not
available & the —
memorandum was
sent with Govt Order
No XXX of the Rules &
for the remission/suspension
of Capital Sentences" in
the deceased under
appealed against the
decision, but the appeal
was rejected —

2. It Govt Counsel
stated that the reference
to Rule XXX was an
error as it does not
apply to cases of
decreased for mercy
& requests permission to
correct the error & restrict
the decreased to a term
of 15 years with reference
to the order of Govt dated
9th Dec 1881 No 927-32
47.

3. Mr Govt agree
with the Dy Comm &
that Rule XXX referred to
which deals with

Of the appointment of strangers should be limited to 3 years does not apply to nominations made in consequence of the dismissals of the office holders for misconduct, but it must be remembered that the object of the Govt order dated 9th May 1881, ~~was to obtain~~ for District dismissals for a period of 10 or 20 years, for, that would amount to converting a dismissal into a suspension for a term of years, but some guarantee to the stranger appointed that the would not be required to quit the office within a definite period, so that there might be sufficient

inducement

was to point out the undesirability of resorting to a permanent deprivation of the family rule except in extreme cases & to lay down the rule of suspension for ~~3 years~~ a term of 7 years for ordinary cases - in fixing the term of suspension regard should be had to the gravity of the offence & the need of

accept the office.—
Nor is it the intention
of Govt that in every
case the stranger appointed
shall have a guarantee
for 10 or 20 years, the
term shall depend
upon the circumstances
of each case & ordinarily
a much shorter time
shall suffice.—

4. The deceased servant
~~or his under-aged heirs~~
shall under no circumstances,
be restored to the office
or his undecided heirs
appointed to ~~xxx~~ it.
during his life time, without
the special sanction of
Govt.— All that is necessary
when a stranger is
appointed to the office, is,
that his appointment shall
be declared temporary
& terminable on the
death of the deceased
servant when the death

In Rex Reece within a certain period in which case the stranger will be allowed to hold office till the expiry of that period.—

5. In the case under notice, it is not clear whether a stranger has been appointed to the office, or a member of the family. In the former case, the Court is authorized to guarantee the office, subject of course to good conduct, till the death of the deceased servant or for 10 or 20 years if death ~~does~~ does not take place before that time. When the death occurs, or the term expires, the question of restoring the office to the heirs of the deceased servant

* Wrong letter from Kottayam

Note

† The order of 1881 is badly worded, but I believe the Appeal of it is what I have stated.— The principle is that the deceased person should not be benefited by the appointment of heirs, but if he dies, I do not see why the stranger should be allowed to hold the office for 10 or 20 years, & the heirs of the deceased person not appointed.— At any rate, such a long period is unnecessary in any case. I shall write verbally modifying that portion of the order.— If you think, we ought not to modify the order to this slight extent without the Government

Petition No. 60 of 95 - 96.

Petitioner - Narasimha, son of
1-6[illegible] Sri. Narasimha of
Vijiana - Respondent.

Petitioner's counsel: Narasimha
Sri Manohar of Vijiana Taluk
Mandya Taluk.

Complainant of first petition
in Regd. Nursing Case registered
against him in 1985 the accus-
-ation from which the right
the Petitioner, who was employed
Karnataka Land in the Government
Evidence from discharging the
duties of the office during Citizenship
Certificate. The official Post-
-mortem affirmed that [illegible] (17-2-85)

In August 1987 after the dis-
-posal of the Criminal Miscellaneous
Petition, Mr. Govindaraj
for Complainant, received the Pe-
-tition and perused the same as
follows:—

" From the above it is abundantly
clear, that in the interest of the
of the Government that the Writ
and Regd. Connected, Petitioner
has the Civil Revision should

Pet-

3

Stating that the principal purpose in view in the contemplated settlement was to secure to Mrs. Gait the payment of £17 per week, as required by specification.

Mr. Justice Farwell, after the opening speech, said, "In the case under notice, it must clearly be understood that the question is not one of family. In the present case, the plaintiff is entitled to the office until she dies, or becomes disqualified to perform its duties, if she should retire from it. Under the agreement, which the testator made, she is entitled to £17 per week, if she should retire from the office, or become disqualified to perform its duties."

Subsequent to the execution of the above agreement, Mrs. Gait was appointed Secretary to the Stating Mutual Benefit Building Society, and she continued to perform the duties of that office until her death, which happened on the 19th of January, 1897. Mr. Gait was duly appointed executor of her will.

5 Petitioner in his appeal urges that his brother's widow Kamerunnissa has stated that he should be appointed, that the dismissal of his brother having been cancelled, there is no reason to keep Petitioner out of office, and that if Col. Jennings's order was still a bar to Petitioner's appointment the Ag. Commissioner should not have made the enquiry regarding the objection of the Sirdar [illegible] him

The appeal petition is out of time by about a month. Petitioner explains that no final order had yet been passed on his appeal (Petition of 1891) that the question is now one of giving due effect to the order passed by Government (on 4th December 92) rectifying the mistake made by Col. Jennings and that the rules of limitation does not therefore affect his appeal.

The Endorsement No 2747 referring Petitioner to the Ag. Com. after the issue of order dated 4-12-92, seems to have been issued without proper authority. I am submitting the draft of that order the Ag. Commr. proposed for

approval [illegible]
Endorsement [illegible]
to the effect [illegible]
were [illegible]
the Councillors or the [illegible]
and the draft endorsement [illegible]
the file is not [illegible]
any body. Nevertheless the substance
ment was [illegible]

The endorsement [illegible]
has [illegible] the question for
consideration is — in case the
appeal is admitted — whether
in passing [illegible] the Order of the
December 1892 the Court had
any intention that petitioner
should be excluded [illegible]
petn case may be reconsidered
Lane says Kawamura and
Hagen are in favor of re
hearing.

Ruled for order.

Petition
Other c
admitte
was conne
Kawamura
by his
appeal was
on 1888.

No. 129

COURT FEE

ONE RUPEE

593

20.8.87

Rw 129

Office of the Durbar Engineer

Dated Jeypore 29th May 1888

31

No. 38-872

Endorsement

In reply to his petition dated 3rd April 1888, Chandhoque Reviah of Bonakal Doddi, Mustafi Taluk, is informed that the Deputy Commissioner has dismissed the Petitioner and his brother after a very careful and complete enquiry: the Diwan concurring in Deputy Commissioner's judgment, rejects the appeal. Connected papers are returned

By Order

Draft

Chief Secretary

P. T. O

COURT FEE

MYSORE

COURT FEE

MYSORE

(General Serial No. 34.)

No. 807

ENDORSEMENT.

In reply to his Petition, dated 5th June 1887

Sirdar Sayed Ghulam Ali Sahib, Bangalore City

L. 1887-4

is informed that

the grounds are shown for any reason

for the rejection of 25th May 1887. Enclosures

are returned.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
7th June 1887.

Draft

By Order,

Secretary.

7/10

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—7-9-85.—2,000.

(General Serial No. 29.)

3056

1888

From The Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District.

To The Secretary to the ~~Chief~~ ~~Commissioner~~ Government of Mysore, ~~Department~~.

Dated 18th

Despatched 20th July 1888.

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 171 } 1888-89.
No.

Sir,

With reference to your No. 1780 dated 5th May last, forwarding for information copy of an endorsement given by you to Cantonment Magistrate of Bangalore, I have the honor to state that I direct that the order of dismissal of Subramanya, the Station Cantonment peon, passed by me on the

26

Proceedings of the Civil Commissioner Nadar Sidrick Queensland dated 5th January 1887.

Read:—

Minutes recorded in Original Case No. 62 dated 3rd June 1886.

2. Proceedings in Criminal Case of 1887 on the file of Subramaniyan Pillai Nagappa in the matter of the complaint of Mudaliyar Sinnasamy Nadar against Nadar Sidrick and Section 323 I.P.C. Code.

3. Order passed by the Commissioner (Mr. Mackenzie) dated 5th Feb. 1887.

4. Proceedings in Criminal Case of 1887 on the file of the Principal Assistant Commissioner and Civil Magistrate Tuticorin against Subramania Pillai accused. Section 465 of the Indian Penal Code.

5. Proceedings in Criminal Case No. 105 of 1883 on the file of the General Assistant Commissioner & Ist Class Magistrate Bhir. Kammaili Complainant Bhuse Gonda & Sitaramayya Accused. Section 511 & 161 of the Indian Penal Code.

6. Para 12 of the Administration Report Submitted by the Mudgere Guides for 1886-87.

7. Proceedings of the Deputy Commissioner dated 17th February 1885.

Order:— Dated Camp Baba 19th August 1887.

Sitaramayya is the Patels Son. Thimmaya of the Kajuna Village in the Mudgere Taluk, and Venkamma is his Mother.

In January 1882 the Deputy Commissioner (Mr. Hamilton) suspended Sitaramayya for five years on Patels Service and entered in the Patels Book of the Villages of Kajuna and also directed the Excise

of the Estates belonging to him during the
time during the period of his contract dated
fifteen. The Supply Commissioner's order is
upheld in the proceedings of the Estate quoted
above.

In 1883 Pitchamuttu was convicted
of an attempt to steal from Nagoor, Cana
Lebbe's house in Kayts, Vol. I Part
Canaan. Vaithy, an illegal gratification
of Rs. 4 and was fined Rs. 50 or 2 months
Commissioner Mahamudale.

In October 1886 one Murugu Thamby
has complained that arrears of Kandyan
for 1885-86 had been demanded from them
while he had paid all dues within time
Rs. 1-2-2 only having been entered in his
Pattah by Vethiya, whereas the amount
actually paid was Rs. 2-3-2 is admitted on
the Estate before the arrivals. Vol. I
of sufficient documentary evidence

Page

Asst. Assistant Commissioner Weitzmeyer dismissed the case, and the fact of Nirmay -ya having interfered with the work of the Shanbhog against orders was noticed.

In connection with the above Mr. Mathieson in his order of the 7th April 1887 states - "He (the Amildar) will also submit a list in detail as to the conduct of Lakamappa and Nanjaya, who in spite of their five years' probation seem never to have ceased from annoying and in every way attempting to impose themselves on the villagers as being Govt. servants, and it seems highly desirable that they should be dismissed as has been recommended by Mr. Weitzmeyer formerly."

On the 23rd January 1889 the Petn. Thammaiah petitioned stating complained the Rehut Commissioner against Lakamappa for having made false

enquiry

Justice on writing for the Justices of the
Village for the Month of January 1887. Notice
which referring to they did from the Notice
hereof of Election in regard to the amount
actually collected from certain Lots were
purchased & sold when it is presumed a
deed is executed at the Expense of the former
Lot owners Instructing
the said Trustees Counsel in the matter
of this Petition, as to Opinion that what-
ever might be the result of a Criminal
Prosecution it was neither for the interests
of Settlement but of the Trials within the
Village Charge that Defendants & his
Counsel Trustees should retain Counsel
the Duties of the Office.

Whereupon Criminal Proceedings entered
against Defendants failed for want of
Evidence sufficient to bring & Convict
the accused, but the Magistrate who
tried

tried him. Enquired upon the conduct
of the accused as having been negligent
in his discharge of the white case.

In para 12 of the administration
Report for 886-87 printed by the Builder,
he observes that in the Nyasa Districts there
were numerous complaints of the deception
practised by the natives in the collection
work.

The Commissioner being again called upon
to report on the character of the two tribes,
subdivide the Shiré one of the old
and leading tribes in the Nyasa District. Their principal
settlement is at Katunga is a man of industrious
character disposed & defraud both the Yao
and the Ajawa. that the Chikunda is
not called a Katunga. and that if
one at Katunga is instigated that Chi-
kunga is pleased one of the Ajawa.

How the slave is treated by

Cease that in the interest of any of the yard
Lands of the Tribes and Gifts enacted,
Neither Chasanuya or her Brother Nechtigua
should receive be entitled with the Superi-
ority Lands for Chasanuya with which they
are invested in Title of Tribes Office thus
Suspension and Removal of the Chief of
the Confederacy Chasanuya Thereupon
Disinherited and his Brother Chasanuya
is Permanently Excluded from holding the
Office of Sachem.

Chasanuya the Present Grantee
is Displaced and Title to the Lands
Granted to aid and Intervention of either
Chasanuya or Nechtigua he should
Resigne be Removed at once.

The Lands should Cease Competent
Reason from the Lands of Chasanuya
to the Superior and Gifts Cease, and Se-
Command them for Examination —

The

The lessee decided that it
did not do the cost of land in the hands
of either of the settlers but unfortunately
widened their interpretation of each separ-
-ate lessee cannot find the Examin-
-ation will not with Government under
Rule XIV of the Section Examination of
Patels & Talati Regn.

Mr. Assistant Commissioner Thana-
-Prantej. Law in his judgment in case of
of 1884, referred & made, remarks as follows
as regards the Conduct of Some Grade,
Patil of Khanjodia "Mr. Mahome
think that either Some Grade the defendants
for the prosecution and Ghanaiya de-
cleared both joint together in defending
the Patel so that the record did not make
from the declaration of the defendants
Both the Patel witness and the Talati witness
for Government

the Words are written by the accused
from dictation & that without it makes
one doubt the accuracy of the statement
the figure in the last A. B. & C. are all
altered & corrected with those in the
Note. Such alterations could only have
been made by the accused if it is true
that he made fraudulent. But from
what the Witness states the Letters
seems to be justify of having collected more
money from her in January than he
issued her receipts for. and unless one
believes that the accused and the Witness
for Prosecution must have planned
together and made these alterations.

Bombelles is suspended for
two years from the office of Notaire on account
of his suspicious conduct in the case &
the Judges should recommend a Com-
-plaint man for the Establishment

all its enclosures.

I inform Lieut Col Stevens of these proceedings & the Journal of Assistant Commissioners in charge of the Mintaro Cadet information and to the Auditor of Mintaro information and guidance.

19th August 84. Signed J. A. Crawford
Deputy Commissioner
Native

"Copy"
Inscription book
Deputy Commissioner
Native Locations

(General Serial No. 32.)

1890. 91

No. 2747

Name of Petitioner. Ramaswami Kavi Chettiyar

Village. Kiliyur

Taluk. Kumbakonam

District. Kistna

Date of Arzi. 1.10.28-87-6

Date of Receipt. 12.1.91

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

Sub 2

This is a petition received subsequent to the steps now taken by the Commissioner in 1889

21/4/92

ABSTRACT.

States that the Petitioners the brothers of Ramaswami Kavi Kumbakonam Pleader, who was, in 89 suspended for 2 years for [illegible] and fair statement and Parani Neeranji Chetty ordered that the petitioners should not be appointed to the office of Ammangal, and Neeranji he was the nominated brother of the said Ramaswami Kavi the order was enquired by the Government in the Proceedings dated 7th January 89.

2. In 88, the said Ramaswami was fined Rs. 50 in a civil [illegible] against him. The Collector who had also a criminal charge against him in 88

was acquitted being found
not guilty.

3. The Deputy Commissioner's
statement that the Petitioner
was interfering in the duties
of the office of the Acting Thuvungan
and carrying the reports of the
villages is groundless.

4. True copies of the orders
from the Salt Authorities
stating that the Petitioner
should help the Acting Thuvungan
in conducting his duties are
hereunto submitted.

5. The Petitioner was not
a Karavathar & he removed
from the office of Thuvungan
but was duly excluded
from the office. The ground
that he was the undivided
brother of the late Lecturer is
false.

6. In 1890 the Pattangattars of the Vaka,
in accordance, have
addressed a petition praying
that the Petitioner may be re-
appointed to the office of
Thuvungan.

7. The Petitioner begs that
under the circumstances of the case
Section 32 of Act 1890 (copy enclosed)
issued by the Madras Government
of the Deputy Commissioner
under

58

Ordered that the Clerk of the Court
do forthwith pay over to
Appointed to the Office of
the said Trust, all Petitioners
Costs but Petitioners
have also leave to
have expert his Account
and the Petitioners

7

2747

24-2-91

Nicomedia
to Pontus Bithynia

8 [illegible]

[illegible]

9 [illegible]

[illegible]

10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

From the Chief Secretary to the Govt of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commr,
Hassan Distt.

Dated 14th
Despatched
Received 24 } Dec/92

Enclosures

Genl No 9257
Jud Pet 1423-92

A. 38-87.

Passing order in the matter of dismissal of Sitaramiya, Shanbogue Srijuna Pillu, Mudgere Taluk.

Read -

Packet from the Deputy Commissioner, Madura, d/ 19th July 1888, No 171 in the matter of the dismissal of Sitaramaiya, Shanbogue Srijura-Sirkar, Mudgere Taluk.

Order thereon. 9251
P.T. 231-92
dy 14. 12. 92.

In August 1887, the Dy Comr dismissed a Shanbogue for certain offences committed by him, and directed the Circle Vakil to select a member of the family of the dismissed for appointment for the office if one was forthcoming who was competent to perform the duties of the office without the intervention of the dismissed incumbent or of his brother, who was also connected with the offences. He further directed that if such a man was not available, the nomination would rest with Govt under Rule xxx of the rules for the

remuneration of Patels and Shanbogues. The dismissed man appealed to Govt against the decision, but the appeal was rejected.

2. The Dy Commr now states that his reference to Rule XXX was an error, as it does not apply to cases of dismissals for misconduct and requests permission to correct the error, restrict the dismissal to a term of 5 years with reference to the order of Govt dated 9th May 1881, No. 927-34/17.

3. As Govt agree with the Dy Commr that Rule XXX referred to which directs that the appointments of strangers should be limited to 3 years does not apply to nominations made in consequence of the dismissals of the office holders for misconduct, but it must be remembered that the object of the Govt order of 9th May 1881 was to point out the undesirability of resorting to a permanent deprivation of the family, but except

except in extreme cases, to lay down the rule of dismissing for a term of years for ordinary cases. In fixing the term of the offence in regard should be had as to the gravity of the offence and the need of some guarantee to the stranger afforded that he would not be required to quit the office within a definite period, so that there might be sufficient encouragement for good men to accept the office. It is not meant that in every case the dismissal should be for a period of five years, but that the stranger appointed should have a guarantee for a like term. The term should depend upon the circumstances of each case and ordinarily a much shorter one will suffice.

4. When dismissal for a term is ordered, the dismissed servant should, under no circumstances, be restored

to the office, or his endeared heirs appointed to it, during his lifetime, without the special sanction of Govt. All that is necessary, when a stranger is appointed to the office, is, that his appointment should be declared temporary, terminable on the death of the dismissed servant, unless the death takes place within a certain period, in which case the stranger will be allowed to hold office till the expiry of that period.

5. In the case under notice, it is not clear whether a stranger has been appointed to the office, or a member of the family. In the former case the Commissioner is authorized to guarantee the office subject of course to good conduct till the death of the dismissed servant or for 10 years, if death should take place before that time. When the death occurs, or the term expires, the question of restoring the office

heirs of the deceased
and will receive due
consideration.

the draft.

2/12

(Chief Secretary.

The Deputy Commissioner,
Kadur District.

comp
RR

Petn No: 2747.
Petnr - Keshavanjn -

Govt
The Petnr is referred
to his Dy Comr: to whom
orders have been issued

Submitted for approval

V

48

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Petition),—dated 14th December 1892.

READ:—

Docket from the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur, dated 19th July 1888, No. 171, in the matter of the dismissal of Sitaramaiya, Shanbhog, Tripura Firka, Mudgere Taluk.

No. 9251—P. F. 231, DATED 14TH DECEMBER 1892

ORDER THEREON.—In August 1887, the Deputy Commissioner dismissed a Shanbhog for certain offences committed by him, and directed the Amildar to select a member of the family of the dismissed servant for the office, if one was forthcoming who was competent to perform the duties of the office, without the intervention of the dismissed man, or of his brother, who was also connected with the offences. He further remarked that if such a man was not available, "the nomination would rest with Government under Rule XXX of the rules for the remuneration of Patels and Shanbhogs." The dismissed man appealed to Government against the decision, but the appeal was rejected.

2. The Deputy Commissioner now states that his reference to Rule XXX was an error, as it does not apply to cases of dismissals for misconduct and requests permission to correct the error and restrict the dismissal to a term of 15 years with reference to the order of Government, dated 9th May 1881, No. 927-34—17.

3. The Government agree with the Deputy Commissioner that Rule XXX referred to which directs that the appointments of strangers should be limited to 3 years does not apply to nominations made in consequence of the dismissals of the office holders for misconduct, but it must be remembered that the object of the Government order, dated 9th May 1881, was to point out the undesirability of resorting to a permanent deprivation of the family Hak except in extreme cases and to lay down the rule of suspension for a term of years for ordinary cases. In fixing the term of suspension, regard should be had alike to the gravity of the offence and the need of some guarantee to the stranger appointed that he would not be required to quit the office within a definite period, so that there might be sufficient inducement for good men to accept the office. It is not meant that in every case the dismissal should be for a period of 10 or 20 years or that the stranger appointed should have a guarantee for a like term. The term should depend upon the circumstances of each case and ordinarily a much shorter one will suffice.

4. When dismissal for a term is ordered, the dismissed servant should, under no circumstances, be restored to the office, or his undivided heirs appointed to it, during his lifetime, without the special sanction of Government. All that is necessary when a stranger is appointed to the office, is, that his appointment should be declared temporary and terminable on the death of the dismissed servant, unless the death takes place within a certain period, in which case the stranger will be allowed to hold office till the expiry of that period.

5. In the case under notice, it is not clear whether a stranger has been appointed to the office, or a member of the family. In the former case, the Deputy Commissioner is authorized to guarantee the office subject of course to good conduct, till the death of the dismissed servant, or for 10 years, if death should take place before that time. When the death occurs, or the term expires, the question of restoring the office to the heirs of the dismissed servant will receive due consideration.

T. ANANDA ROW,
Chief Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District.

Exd.—A.N.S.

49

No. 2747-



MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT;
26 December 1892

Endorsement granted to Venkatarama, late Shanbogue of Sigeru Sima, Kadigere District.
in reply to his Petition Registered No. 2747 dated 12th Dec. 92.

L.A. 38-87-8

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ referred to the Deputy Commissioner, to whom orders have been issued.

2. The enclosures are returned

9.1.93

"By Order,"

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000.

2947 S/1

(General Serial No. 32.).

S/1893. 13

No. 601

Name of Petitioner. Thandoge Kenna

Village. Tippura Teeka

Taluk. Mercara

District. Kadur 1A 38-87

Date of Arzi. 21-8-93

Date of Receipt. 29-5-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil.

ABSTRACT.

That in reply to his appeal petition dated 21st addressed to this office re his claim to the Shanbogue of the Tippura Teeka, he was referred to the Deputy Commissioner by Endorsement No. 1471. That under orders of the Deputy Commissioner and the Amildar of the Mercara Taluk, the Sheristadar of Kunatta Magani reported that the Paleeand the ryots are willing to have Petitioner as their Shanbogue. That Kaveramma, widow of the deceased Shanbogue Lingaramiah also presented on 1st February 1894 a petition to the Deputy

Commissioner requesting him to appoint Petitioner, who is her brother-in-law, to the Thanlagi office. That in their Proceedings of 1892, the Government has ordered that the Thanlagi of the Tejura Pirka is suspended only for ten years from 1892, and, after that period, the Thanlagiship may be reinstated in the office, and, if he be dead, his brother may be appointed to the office. And that the Deputy Commissioner has granted a Khanaroo Endorsement to the following effect:—

"In reply to the petition dated 27th February 1893, I am to inform that Col. Campbell in his Proceedings of 1889 has ordered that the Petitioner and his elder brother should never be allowed to look after the work, and that their conduct is blameworthy. This order has been confirmed by Government. The Petitioner was informed of this by endorsement dated 5th December 1890. Moreover Kamanna has been registered as the Thanlagi, and the work is looked after by Gumastahs. Nothing more can be done to the Petitioner."

Petitioner prays that action
may be stayed, pending
trial to the Supreme Court.

Rad
4-9-93

(General Serial No. 22.)

1893.

No. 1861

Name of Petitioner. Kesavappa, Inspected Shanbhog

Village. Krishnapura Khurkia

Taluk. Gadag

District. Kadur

Date of Arzi. 9-11-93

Date of Receipt. 20-11-93.

Date of Disposal. 1638-27-10

No. of Enclosures. Ten

ABSTRACT.

With reference to this office
order memorandum No: 601, dated 29th
September 1893, the petitioner
re-submits his petition, duly
stamped, adducing the proofs
provided proving his right for
re-entering and taking the charge
of his Shanbhogue office.

Dated 2nd Aug 1893

MYSORE DEWAN'S
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 601R
DATE 24-8-93

54, (12)

No. 10

To.

The Officer of the Legislative
Council of
His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore.

Most honoured Sirs.

The undersigned Kadur agent of the Amalgamated Shanbog Families of Anjur Sir, Kadur Amaldars Salute begs to bring the following few lines into your kind consideration, and thereby hopes that his request will be answered with success.

You had been graceous enough to grant me an endorsement No 2, 4, dated 3rd January 1891 in which endorsement it had been stated, that orders have been issued to the Deputy Commr. Kadur District. When I requested the Deputy Commr. Kadur District for orders, an order was issued to the Amildar Amalgamated Families that enquiry should be made as how the Patels of the Hoblis of the Taluk mentioned above, are disposed towards my being appointed as the Shanbog. Orders from the Taluk was given to the Sheristadar Sheristadar for enquiry. From the two Hoblis mentioned above, when the Shanbog Cases arose (Ex. No. 2, 3, 4) for the Kadur enquiry I was told that the Patels and the Ryots were quite willing to have me as their Shanbog.

Kavadadu Venkoji of the deceased Shanbog Seetharamaiya, handed a petition, dated 27-2-93 the Deputy Commr

Saint District, that he was appointed
that, the District of Prince Albert,
should be appointed as the Standing
two deals, and agreed to, immediately.
The Deputy Commissioner then thought it
expedient that, in case, the total
should be appointed as the Standing.

I have also heard that in the
Proceedings of Sir J. Shaughnessy
Esquire, Senior Assistant Engineer, it is
stated that the Standing Committee
to consider for the years 1885, 1886
and after that period the Standing is freed
from suspension, in case of the Standing
being died, his brother shall have
with him in the same family, shall be
appointed as the Standing.

In spite of all this, the Deputy
Commissioner, Saint District, do not
know with what intention, however we
ordered in which my claim is completely
included. The order is awaited.

I, therefore, humbly beg your
honour to confer the boon of appointing me
as the Standing, and to give me an order

I beg to remain,
Your honour's
Yours most obedient servant.

Signed.

dated 20th December 1892 and in which the Deputy commissioner's infringement of the law apparently said.

II — The relationship between me and the wife of deceased Thambiyy mentioned in the said endorsement is nothing but shunning my entrance in the office.

III — If the Deputy com considered as final as the proceedings of the last Deputy com itself is fundamental to his judgment, what made him to enquire every head of the Jirka, regarding my conduct. I beg to draw your good attention to this point, if the inhabitants of the Jirka taken any head of me, he would have taken as good ground for his unjustifiable Judgement. Unfortunately wasn't. Therefore he entirely left of the subject.

IV — Whereas the Thambiyy who was suspended was out of the encumberance under the law and proceedings of the benevolent Dewan. Now does the proceedings of the last Deputy com would debarred my entrance in the office. That who I did not work as a Thambiyy from my birth at all and committed any offence.

V — The proceedings of the Dewan dated 7th February 1885 stated "the exclusion of the forfeiture from (myself) from discharging the duties of the office during the time of the suspension is equally right". Now the period of suspension is varied. Why should I enter in the Kachcheri office

VI — In the proceedings of the Dewan dated 20th December 1892, it is stated that after the death of suspended Thambiyy his relation shall enter in the office.

VII — The karanakkar Thambiyy (my brothers wife) is still under my protection we are undivided. She requested the

Deputy.

Deputy Collr. that I should be Karnardar; this request was utterly refused. Where is Justice in the District? I am male member of the family undivided and competent to hold the office, to discharge the work and brother of the diceased Ghani[illegible]:

I am

Your most obedient servant.

Duly stamped as per orders

[illegible] 1361.

[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE
1 DEC. 93

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 30-4-93 [illegible]

[illegible] 29-8-93 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1893 [illegible]

[illegible] 28 [illegible] 1-12

[illegible]

[illegible]

"By order"

[illegible signature]

for Chief Secretary.

No. 66/6-135/1-2248

24-7-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

4-7-1894

Endorsement granted to ~~Chowdiah~~ Kuccrah &
Krishna Setty Bangalore Taluk.

24

L.R. 38-87-11

in reply to his Petition Registered No. ~~66/6-135/1-2248~~ dated ~~24-7-94~~ ~~appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr~~
~~& Sessions Judge~~ ~~dismissing his appeal against the order of the Asst Commr~~
~~of Bangalore Taluk~~ Kadur his ~~petition~~ dated 30/6/1893 de-
claiming to appoint Petitioner ~~to be~~ Patel of Jenupura Hobli

Petitioner is informed that ~~his~~ his claim to the Office
cannot be admitted as
he was convicted in the
offences committed by his
late father, and as his
appeal was rejected in
1888.

2. The enclosures are returned

2/7/94

Correct. Draft.

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—6-8-94.—200

Refd by 1892 ends
Genl Reds
1.5.99 Please put up D.F. 231/1892
containing the Proceedings
referred to in the Petn

AK
1.5.99 Petition for —
D.F. 231-92 containing
the reference orders &c.

Sub
2/5/99

RJB
2/5/99
Please see Lr: No 10 from
the Proceedings referred to
in the Petn

AK
2/5/99
Subd
C/ 2Rs Stamp affixed. Stamps Fixed

(2/ The Dept's order complained of
~~was~~ was communicated to Petr
in Appellate's endt dt 8.4.99
In time
MKH
3.5.99 (3/ The present Petn amounts to
an application for review of the
Dept. (endt) served to Petr on 24.7.92.

No report has been received from the
Dr Comm with refce to para 5 of Govt
Proc. No 7251
Pet 7231-92 dt 14-12-92. Sd(illegible),
although it appears from certain
orders passed by him and produced
on former occasions by petr that
the office of Shanbague has been
resd in the name of Kaveramma
widow of deceased brother Seetharamiah
and the work conducted by fumasthas.

The term of 10 years specified
in para 5 of the above Proc has
expired, may, this petn be forwarded
to the Dr Comm for report with refce
to paras 4 & 5 of the said Proc on re-
ceipt of which final orders may be
passed, refusing to receive any re-
presentations on the subject by
petr.

Subd to 2nd Asst Commr
Cantt
C/ 6/5/99 4/5/99
Referred

60

1899.

No. 1739.

Name of Petitioner T. Keshaviah
Hakkar Kanakkay &

Village Trapura Tirtha

Taluk Mudgere

District Kadur Lbl 38-87-12

Date of Arzi 24-4-99.

Date of Receipt 28-4-99.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2

ABSTRACT

Appeal against Amildars
order No 2 dt 3-4-99 ~~in~~
conveying that on the Govt
No 6 dt 28-3-99 stating
as follows:—
"On perusing the previous
records it is found that
you were dismissed for
bad conduct & that the
matter cannot be taken
up on hand. Col: Campbell
& Mr Sparks having come
to the above opinion,
nothing can be done
to you now."
The Petr states that, since

Ms. 9251 / P.7231-92 dt 14-12-92 (appointing another man to the Shanbhogi of Tripura firka till the death of Leetharamiah the Rely. husband, or for 10 years in case Leetharamiah died earlier) the Shanbhogi of the above firka must be given to him on the following grounds:—

1. that Leetharamiah died in 1890.
2. that by this time the term mentioned in the above proceedings is completed, Leetharamiah being dismissed in the year 1887,
3. that he & Leetharamiah were undivided brothers.
4. that he is the only male member of the family his brother dying without issue.
5. that records of 1893 & the Rely. of the inhabitants of the above village 30-11-95 show that he is a man of good character.
6. that his brother's wife is under his protection now.
7. that he was never a Shanbhog karnamdar.

Prays that the Shanbhogi of Tripura firka consisting

to him.

62 Encl. to Auditor Genl's
No 290 - dt. 4-4-99.

2. Govt Proceedings
No 9257
P.7.231-92 dt 14-12-92.

SM
29/4/99

1739

MINISTRY OF MANS OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD No 173901
DATE 28-4-93

3

4

5

Subd 52nd Councillor with refs to order on petn No 1739 (S No 19)

Rec'd (1) It is now clear that the widow of Sitanamaya, brother of the petr, has been registered as hukdar, the duties being performed by a gumasta. (2) As regards the petr's claim to the office, it has been three times disallowed by Govt on account of his bad antecedents (S Nos 385, 11, 17)

30/6/99

R 7 Rm. 30.6.99

Declined to interfere - may if he can succeed in respect of his claim as has been twice disallowed

Ch 13.2.00

Draft Endorsement put up
Lsg. 15.2.00

8217

Pet 47 1898—99

(21)

From The Deputy Commissioner Madura District

To The Secretary to Govt General and Revenue Depts

Dated 22nd

Despatched 24th June 1899

Received

General No. 646
No.

L.R. 38-87-13

Enclosure No. Petitioner's accounts.

Reporting on the petition of V. Ramanuja appealing against the order of this office declining to recognize petitioner's claim to the Shanbhogi of the Virgina Fasli in the Nundagana Taluk.

Pet
26.6.99

Recd 27/6. Q.J. 231 of 92 & connecting refs put up. Please see Lr. No. 2. for the order of 1888. refd to in the letter.

AK
28/6/99.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kadur District.

Chikmagalur, 22nd June 1899

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

To

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
General and Revenue Depts

Sir,

In reply to your official memorandum No Ret 251-92 of the 15th May 1899, forwarding for report the petition of J. Meshariah appealing against the order of this office declining to recognize his claim to the kandchar of the Sringeri Circle in the Mudgere Taluk, I have the honor to submit the following report.—

2. The petitioner requested the recognition of his claim to the office in question on the ground that the period of 10 years during which his family had, in G. O. No 9257/92 231 of the 14th December 1892, been proscribed from holding it, had expired, and that further, his brother, who had been dismissed for misconduct, had died; but Mr Carr (the then Deputy Commissioner) in his order of the 28th March 1894

1899 refused to [illegible] the question
as the petitioner had also been dis-
missed for bad conduct-viz
Colonel Campbell's and Mr Charles'
orders in the file hereunto sent.

3. The letter of the petitioner
having left no issue and the peti-
tioner himself having been perma-
nently excluded from holding the
office and that order having been
approved by Government on appeal
made by him in their order No 120 of
the 29th May 1885, Mr Charles in his
order of the 4th April 1892, directed
that the office should be registered
in the name of Kaviamma, the
widow of the deceased, and she
was allowed to perform the
ceremonies, which she has done.

4. The petition with its enclosures,
received with the News under reply,
is herewith returned together with the
vernacular correspondence which
please kindly return when no longer
required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner

(881)

Pet
A 231-92 P 94)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

66

A 38-87-11

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 1739 dated 24-4-97 received at the Dewan's Office from T. Kesavaiah of Tirupatiha Madgere Taluk, appealing against the order passed by Deputy Commissioner, Kadur dt. declining to recognise the claims of the petitioner for the inheritance of the above property

is forwarded, together with its two enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kadur District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report ~~of the facts of the case, and on~~ ~~with reference to paras 4 and 5~~ ~~the points urged in the petition.~~ of Asst Proc's No 2251 dated 14-12-97 A 231-97

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned

By order,

Secretary.

BANGALORE,

15/5/1899

12/5/99

[illegible]

[illegible] 8 [illegible]

Vol/15.2.00. [illegible]

please

By order

Draft

C2

for Secretary

[illegible]

No. Pet 8 1.3.00
231-92

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kadur District with the records received with his letter No. 646 of 24.6.99.

By order

Draft.

Secretary

[illegible]

26.2.00

[illegible]